

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
PORTLAND DIVISION**

**JOHNTE RAY LIEN;  
ZAFAR ABDULLAH,**

Plaintiffs,

No. 3:19-cv-01630-CL

v.

**ORDER**

**COLETTE PETERS; TIM  
CAUSEY; KENNETH BALL;  
GILLIAN SODERSTRUM;  
DENNIS HOLMES; ANGIE  
MURPHY,**

Defendants.

---

AIKEN, District Judge.

This case comes before the Court on a Findings and Recommendation filed by Magistrate Judge Mark Clarke. ECF No. 68. Judge Clarke recommends that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 49, be granted in part and denied in part.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act, the Court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations, "the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

For those portions of a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations to which neither party has objected, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) ("There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate's report to which no objections are filed."). Although no review is required in the absence of objections, the Magistrates Act "does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard." *Id.* at 154. The Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that "[w]hen no timely objection is filed," the court should review the recommendation for "clear error on the face of the record."

In this case, Defendants have filed Objections, ECF No. 76, and Plaintiffs have filed a Response, ECF No. 79. The Court has reviewed the record, the F&R, the Objections, and Response and finds no error. The F&R, ECF No. 68, is therefore ADOPTED. Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 49, is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part. Plaintiffs' RLUIPA claim and requests for declaratory and injunctive relief are DISMISSED but Defendants' Motion is otherwise DENIED.

It is so ORDERED and DATED this 25th day of August 2022.

/s/Ann Aiken  
ANN AIKEN  
United States District Judge